

The program does not deserve such treatment. Slow and fumbling in getting off the ground, it is now beginning to show achievements. Almost every Latin American State has already or is in the process of overhauling its tax structure. Land reforms are moving ahead. Roads, schools, hospitals, sewage nets are being built. Small businessmen are receiving Alliance loans for expansion. At the same time, other fortuitous signs of Latin American advancement are appearing—the regional economic integration movements and the slowly rising prices of major commodities.

Of course there is disappointment and grumbling—over the slowness of reform on the one hand, and the slowness of money on the other—but on the balance it is widely accepted that the program is providing a real stimulus to progress. The United States must remember that the \$1 billion a year promised by Washington is not the Alliance for Progress, but only a small part of it. Its chief importance is to provide a catalyst which will set off a much larger and purely Latin American reaction. By trimming its commitment, Washington at a very minimum will do irreparable harm to a burgeoning Alliance spirit that only now is beginning to take hold.

The call on Alliance funds will be greater in the coming year than ever before. Peru and Argentina will be back in the program with their return to democratic rule. Major commitments to Chile and Colombia must be continued. If the dust settles in Brazil, new projects will rise again there. After setting rigidly high standards for development aid, Washington is hardly in a position to default once its demands have been met.

The \$350 million authorization for AID, which still would face the menace of the appropriations bills to follow, cannot stand. Nor can a simple halving of differences between the Senate and House estimates. At the very least, we submit, \$100 million must be restored to the AID request. If this is not achieved, the United States will have reneged on the Alliance for Progress.

More Than Forgiveness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I call the attention of my colleagues to the following sermon "More Than Forgiveness" as delivered by the Reverend Robert G. Eppler, minister of the Second Presbyterian Church in Louisville, Ky.:

"MORE THAN FORGIVENESS"—SERMON DELIVERED JULY 21, 1963, BY REV. ROBERT G. EPPLER

FOREWORD

This sermon, which mounts an all-out attack against liberalism and its handmaiden—the institutional or organized church—requires a foreword of explanation. It is a carefully prepared examination of the fantastic folly that often masquerades, beneath a mantle of respectability, as good government and devout churchmanship in our Nation today.

Because of the frightening events which are unfolding in such bewilderingly swift fashion throughout Europe, Asia, South America, and the United States, the cleavage that has long existed between the left and the right is no longer merely an ideological

difference of opinion. The conflict that looms ahead carries with it, for the concerned Christian conservative, the potential dimensions of a struggle to the death, if that be required.

It is our conviction that the Christian faith, as "once and for all delivered to the saints," faces the most grave threat to its long and glorious history. The danger we face is both internal and external and at its core is the unerringly clever work of Satan. In such perilous times we may ill afford an organized or institutional church, that merely pays lipservice to the Biblical guidelines that represent her most solemn responsibility. This, then, is a plea for Christian believers to return to the church of the Scriptures, the church of which Jesus Christ is the head and Saviour. Finally, it is a plea for Christians to return to the basic task and sacred commission of the church: to proclaim the Gospel of Jesus Christ to a weary and sin-sick world.

MORE THAN FORGIVENESS

Text: "God Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Luke 18:18

Yesterday afternoon the sun, which normally shines bright and clear at this time of the day, was in three quarter eclipse. Another object, the moon, had placed itself between earth and our source of life-giving heat, the sun. The result was a gradual blackening of the skies until the land lay in semidarkness.

This is a precise description of what is happening to Christian faith and witness throughout the United States today. Another object, a satanic power, has placed itself between us and our source of life, the sovereign God. The result has been a gradual blackening of our skies, until the land lies in moral and spiritual darkness. Like the sun yesterday, this Nation is today in partial eclipse. It is our intention to examine issues and reasons that have brought us to this tragic state, and discover what may yet be done to avert complete disaster.

One of the greatest dangers that faces the Christian community today, is the failure of our ministers to realistically preach God's message of eternal life. A ministry that is solely preoccupied with the affairs of this life, that overwhelmingly concerns itself with the welfare and creature comforts of this world, is a direct betrayal of Biblical truth and represents the extreme prostitution of the life and work of our Lord Jesus Christ. We rightly label this apostasy "The Social Gospel," and recognize it as the illegitimate child of that bleak and austere cult known as liberalism.

It is high time that the liberal establishment of this country be called to a stern accounting of its more than 30 years of leadership. It is time for religious, governmental, business, and labor leaders of the left, to tell the truth about their profligate handling of the public trust, which has long been their evident responsibility. It is time for decent, God-fearing people to call a halt to the madness that constitutes much of the spiritual, political, and economic fabric of the liberal left. Nothing less than our continuing existence in this life, and perhaps the life beyond, depends upon such action.

The gospel of Luke tells of a rich ruler who inquired of Jesus, "What shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Note that he asked about life eternal, or more precisely, life beyond this one. In directing this inquiry to Jesus the rich ruler showed an apparent wisdom beyond his years, although there is evidence to suggest the question was posed in disdain. It is interesting to conjecture as to whether he genuinely understood that our Lord could offer him more than forgiveness, important as that surely was.

The rich ruler inquired about eternal life and in response Jesus indicated that he should not commit adultery, kill, steal, or

bear false witness. In addition he should honor his father and his mother. The rich ruler's reply was quick and confident; he had kept all these things since his youth. We can visualize Jesus standing before this man and reading his innermost thoughts. With a smile He said, "Sell all that thou hast * * * and follow me." It was at this vital point that the rich ruler faltered and fell by the wayside. The price was too high for him to pay. Luke writes, "And when he heard this, he was very sorrowful: for he was very rich."

Christ's lesson is clear. Those who have given up their home and possessions for the kingdom will find greater spiritual riches, both now and in the life to come. The rich ruler inquired about life eternal, when in reality his hopes, plans and ambitions were rooted in the affairs of this world. As such he deluded himself; and characterizes the "liberal" prototype of our age.

Before we examine some examples of the Liberal's retreat from reason within the church, let it be freely acknowledged that the Christian conservative falls under God's judgment, as do all men. He is not exempt. Let it be freely acknowledged that this country also falls under the same judgment. God has it within His power and Biblical authority to subjugate this Nation to his omnipotent will, for Jesus Christ is Sovereign over all nations. To maintain otherwise, is presumptuous.

For illustration we pose a hypothetical situation, but one that is not without truth and irony, however. What would transpire were the rich ruled to appear before today's church leaders and inquire, "What must I do to inherit eternal life?" The dialogue, a favorite expression among leftwing intellectuals, might develop something like this:

Rich ruler: "Good Master, what must I do to inherit eternal life?"

The church: "My brother do not fret, unity is close at hand. Soon we shall all be one great ecumenical brotherhood, under the benevolent, omniscient direction of the Lord's handiwork, the National Council of Churches."

Rich ruler: "But how may I inherit eternal life?"

The church: "Rich ruler. The church seeks equal opportunities for all. We are laboring night and day influencing social legislation throughout the Nation. For your information, the National Council of Churches, which speaks for 40 million Protestants, consistently concerns itself with the vital 'religious' issues of our day. Among other things:

"We have insisted on drastic change in immigration laws, designed to protect us from undesirable aliens. Is not every man our brother?"

"We have sought to repeal the Connally reservation, and opposed the Bricker amendment, both of which were designed to protect the Nation from the blandishments of world government."

"We are engaged in a relentless struggle against right-to-work laws, or any laws that seek to regulate unions."

Rich ruler: "But my soul. What must I do to be—"

The church: "Brother, the church is busy for you. Some of our strongest efforts and much of your money, have been spent in the following Christian enterprises:

"Passing overtures in our denominational assemblies, commending the abolishment of Bible reading and prayer in public schools."

"Circulating petitions by the hundreds of thousands, protesting the imprisonment of convicted spies and traitors."

"Supporting civil liberty for antisocial behavior and political conspiracy."

"Seeking to abolish capital punishment."

"Urging immediate recognition of Red China and admitting her to the United Nations."

1963

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5887

At this same time, a musical society was organized which is the oldest musical society in the United States, this being the old Stoughton Musical Society. Many people from Avon have participated in the activities of this musical society from the beginning.

In the Civil War period, Thomas Cosgrove is listed as a Congressional Medal of Honor winner, from the records at Washington, D.C. He was the first and only citizen of the town to have won this honor.

During the period 1830-70, Negroes, escaping from the South, found refuge in the swamps of Avon, where they established a colony, which lasted for 40 years.

In the early days, most of the inhabitants were farmers or hunters, until the making of shoes became the livelihood of the families, at sometimes all members of the family working on this project. May's Corner, at South and West Main Streets, and the Littlefield homes on East Main Street near East Spring Street, were the first to make shoes in the home.

The first shoe factories built were the Tucker, Littlefield, Peach, and Foster factories. Also built was a large tannery, later followed by the manufacture of rubber soles, moccasins, welts, shanks, and cutting dies.

There has been little increase in industrial development during the past few years, with the town being, basically a residential community, and a bedroom town for commuters to Boston and other communities. At the present time the town has an active industrial and development commission, making every effort to secure business and industry for the town.

Transportation facilities have always been good in Avon, from the horsecar period, when Avon was the first community to be provided horsecar service from Brockton.

Forty-five trucking firms service Avon, with one-half hours bus service from Avon to Boston. Avon is easily accessible to Logan Airport and other important points, with travel time from Avon to downtown Boston being only 18 minutes by car when the Amvet's Highway (Fall River Expressway) is completed and becomes a part of Route 128 and the Southeast Highway, now under construction. Route 28, from New Hampshire to Cape Cod, runs through Avon.

With the opening of the Amvet's Highway, many fine industrial sites will be made available and will open excellent potential for industrial development that will change the town somewhat, but also will help materially in the broadening of the tax base, and bringing about a better balanced economy for the town.

Avon has been well favored regarding parks, as in the not-to-distant past Highland Park, now a residential area, was considered to be one of the most beautiful street railway parks in New England, with scores of gardeners being employed to keep up the landscape and the property in general. The first electric fountain in New England was constructed at this park. It also included a large zoo, open-air vaudeville shows, and a regulation ball park, where the New England League played for many years, with such ballplayers as Lajoie, Young, Hooper, and Parent all played, as well as Burns, the third-base coach for the Red Sox, made his debut.

Avon also has a considerable part of the beautiful D. W. Field Parkway within its boundaries, with this park being beautifully landscaped and equipped with brooks, streams, and lakes, with picnic facilities being available for all, with hundreds of ducks for children to feed, and ponds stocked with fish for the pleasure of both young and old fishermen. This park is the attraction of thousands from Boston and many other parts of eastern Massachusetts.

When you think of Avon, think of a town where livability is our most precious asset,

a community where all newcomers are welcome and rapidly become a most important part of our town.

John S. Monagan
Let's Not Default on the Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 18, 1963

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, sober second thought has emphasized the irresponsibility of the wholesale, across-the-board slashes which were made in the foreign aid bill through Republican leadership and almost unanimous Republican action.

I made it clear during the discussion of the Foreign Assistance Act that I made no claim that the foreign aid program was perfect in operation and execution. I have always conceded that there were broad areas in which improvement was necessary to maintain the required public and congressional support.

On the other hand, I believe that certain parts of the program are essential to our national security and that we must necessarily bear with some waste and mismanagement in these sections where experimentation and improvisation are necessary, from the very nature of the shifting problems.

One area where the wholesale slash was most regrettable was in the authorization for the Alliance for Progress. No one can maintain that the future of Latin America is not intimately tied with the security of the United States; yet, the reduction in funds for AID for the Alliance amounted to \$150 million. This reduction would force a 30 percent across-the-board cutback in the entire Latin program.

While the Alliance program has been slow in starting and was introduced with exaggerated claims, nevertheless, the fact remains that some solid advances are being made and it would be tragic not to give the administrators the benefit of the doubt in this area for a reasonable time to come.

Incidentally, it is a strange commentary that those who are most vigorous in their criticism of Castro and most apprehensive about the danger of his influence spreading in Latin America are in the forefront of those who would deny funds to the Alliance for Progress which seeks to stimulate the private economic growth which would make Castro-like revolutions improbable.

Along the line of these general thoughts, I should like to share with my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the Vision letter of August 27, 1963. The Vision letter is a normally temperate and informed commentary on Latin American affairs and the reasonable yet admonitory tone of this editorial is one that should be heeded:

DEFAULTING ON THE ALLIANCE

The annual numbers game over foreign aid is now going on in Washington. The

House trims, the Senate reluctantly restores, the President pleads, and a last-minute compromise produces—or has in the past—just about what everyone expected in the first place. This time, however, it is widely recognized that a major departure from this ritual is in the works. For a variety of reasons—concern over the balance of payments deficit, sloppy parliamentary tactics on the part of the administration, and the civil rights struggle prominent among them—the cuts are going unusually deep. The final compromise figure will be probably well below what Presidents of both parties have called in the past the irreducible minimum.

At issue here is not the foreign aid bill or the sweeping arguments for and against it, but a straight question on hemisphere relations: Is the United States about to default on the promises of the Alliance for Progress?

The question is raised because last week's House vote reducing the foreign aid authorization bill to \$3.5 billion, included a slash in AID funds for the Alliance—from a requested \$500 million to \$350 million. At least some of the money, it can be assumed, will be restored. But, whether this will be enough to continue the program even at its present inadequate level is seriously in doubt. And to give a rough idea of what an appropriation of \$350 million would mean to the Alliance in simple financial terms, AID sources reveal that it will force a 30 percent across-the-board cutback in its entire program. It is impossible to believe at this critical juncture in Alliance history that this is the Congress aim.

Foreign aid, for good and bad reasons, has a poor reputation with the majority of the American people. From an arm of foreign political and economic policy, it has come to be seen as an international pork barrel. To judge whether or not this is true in the specific case of the Alliance for Progress, a few basic facts need to be reexamined.

The Alliance is intended to be a cooperative venture between the world's richest and most powerful Nation and its struggling, semideveloped neighbors. The demands it makes on the Latin American side are immense. These countries are expected to forge, virtually overnight, a sweeping popular revolution that alters the very fabric of their national societies, while at the same time squeezing out a level of capital investment in the public sector of at least \$6 billion a year.

The United States, in hopes of achieving a peaceful and profitable trading partner and to dike its hemisphere walls against predatory communistic incursion, has promised a general level of governmental aid of \$1 billion a year with private investment, funds from international agencies, and aid from other developed nations, raising the total to \$2 billion a year.

The lion's share of the burden, and properly so, falls upon the Latin American States. As much as their freedom and prosperity is in our interest, it is doubly so in their own. Nonetheless, the fuel that makes the Alliance run is U.S. support.

In the first 2 years Washington either met or came close to meeting its \$1 billion obligation, depending on how the figures are juggled. This year, food for peace, the Eximbank, the social progress trust fund, and smaller sources are expected to make up about half the total, with AID providing the other half. Thus, the \$500 million asked by AID was not an inflated request designed for later compromise, but close to bedrock needs for meeting our Alliance promises. The \$150 million cut, which cannot possibly be made up from other sources, would clearly put us way below the \$1 billion mark.